

(Mr. HASTINGS) the chairman of the ethics committee, for his efforts to resolve the regrettable impasse that has prevented the committee from organizing. He has made a thoughtful and good-faith attempt to clear up any misunderstanding and resolve any perceived concerns.

But this was rejected out of hand by our friends on the other side of the aisle. Why? Because their concerns are neither real nor substantive. They want the committee to be in limbo. They are creating an issue for political purposes without any positive ideas about how to resolve the very serious challenges facing our Nation. Negativity and political attacks are their only strategy.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. Let us move forward constructively and stop abusing our ethics process for purely political gain.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REMEMBERING EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 35th anniversary of the first Earth Day, which is considered the birth of the modern environmental movement in this country. In the 3½ decades since, it was first celebrated in 1970, Earth Day has become a day for reflection, a day for education, and a day for action. It provides an annual benchmark by which we can measure our progress as stewards of our planet.

That stewardship is about more than preserving pristine wilderness and endangered species. Our economic and national security are also at stake. The biggest impediment to sound environmental policies in the United States comes from those who see environmentalism as competing with our economic prosperity and our national security.

The energy bill that was just considered by the House was advertised by its supporters as providing security for America by reducing our dependence on foreign sources of fossil fuels. It does this through \$8 billion in tax breaks to encourage domestic production.

Unfortunately, 95 percent of the tax subsidies benefit the oil, gas, coal and nuclear industries, while only 5 percent are directed towards wind, solar and other renewable sources. In my opinion, the energy bill is a short-sighted response to two of the central strategic challenges confronting our country, beginning the transition to a post-fossil-fuel economy and reducing the emission of greenhouse gases that every

reputable scientist knows are contributing to global warming.

We cannot drill our way to energy independence. We cannot burn our way to a cleaner environment. We cannot go on behaving as if time and resources are on our side.

Rather than making America more secure, the energy bill does the opposite. Both economically and in terms of our national security, the policies enshrined in this bill will make us profoundly weaker.

In doing so, we have shied away from the challenge of developing new ways of powering our lives by unleashing the driving force behind America economic competitiveness, technological innovation mixed with entrepreneurship.

□ 1700

And while America sits on the sidelines, our competitors in Europe and Asia are developing technologies that will enable them to reduce fuel consumption and lower emissions of greenhouse gases. Rather than American entrepreneurs driving these changes, it is our competitors who prosper.

In just one graphic example, there are 6-month waiting lists to buy Japanese hybrids while American car makers fall further and further behind.

In addition to environmental and economic considerations, there are equally compelling national security reasons to confront the scarcity and costs of oil, the challenge of global warming and environmental degradation. Imagine the increased strength, independence, and security that would come to an America that could tell the oil-producing nations, we do not need your oil, we do not want your oil, we can do better. And imagine the risk to America if we negligent the sobering evidence of global warming.

Last year the Pentagon's Office of Net Assessment issued a report on the national security aspects of climate change. The report evaluated one scenario in which the Earth's climate rose by 5 degrees in North America over a 15-year period between 2005 and 2020. The consequences of such a rapid temperature increase were myriad and catastrophic: drought, fire, storms and sea levels that rose around the world, flooding heavily populated coastal regions.

Unfortunately, the administration has failed to provide leadership or vision on this issue. Senior level positions at the National Security Council and in the Department of Defense dealing with the security threat of environmental degradation have been downgraded or eliminated. From the President on down, this administration has had a contempt for science that is at odds with its policy or belief.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Nation should be marshaling its talents and resources for a new Manhattan Project to make practical solar, wind, and wave energy, we have instead opted to subsidize the extraction of every last barrel of oil and ton of coal that we can get our hands on.

Even as we have driven up the financial burden on our children through reckless fiscal policies, we are imperiling their very existence through willful neglect of our responsibilities to the environment. I can only hope that we will not have to tell our grandchildren, to paraphrase the words of Kurt Vonnegut, We could have saved the Earth, but we were too darned cheap.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 6, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF LT. ILARIO PANTANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at length on the floor about Second Lt. Ilario Pantano, a Marine who served this Nation bravely in both gulf wars.

During his service in Iraq last year, Lt. Pantano was faced with a very difficult decision that caused him to make a split-second decision to defend his life. He felt threatened by the actions of two insurgents under his watch, and in an act of self-defense he had to resort to force. Two and a half months later, a sergeant under his command who never even saw the shooting accused him of murder. Lt. Pantano now faces two counts of murder.